

WISCONSIN HIGHWAY RESEARCH PROGRAM

PROJECT NO. 0092-01-06

**REHABILITATION TECHNIQUES FOR
CONCRETE BRIDGES**

FINAL REPORT

by

Habib Tabatabai
Al Ghorbanpoor
Amy Turnquist-Nass

Department of Civil Engineering and Mechanics
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

March 2005

DISCLAIMER

This research was funded through the Wisconsin Highway Research Program by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration under Project No. 0092-01-06. The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation or the Federal Highway Administration at the time of publication.

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for its contents or use thereof. This report does not constitute a standard, specification or regulation.

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade and manufacturers' names appear in this report only because they are considered essential to the object of the document.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the following individuals who as employees of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation or as members of this project's oversight committee contributed to this effort: Mr. Edward Fitzgerald, Mr. Stan Woods, Mr. Thomas Strock, Mr. Bob Wysocki, Mr. David Bechthold, Mr. Bruce Karow, Mr. Patrick Kern, and Mr. John Goetter. Acknowledgment is also given to the Precast Prestressed Producers of Illinois and Wisconsin (PPPIW) for partial funding for the production of test specimens used in this study. In addition, recognition is given to Spancrete Industries, Inc. and Mr. Vern Coenen for the production and shipment of the test specimens, and Mr. A. Ganjehlou of ABM Corporation of New York City for donation of the Replark carbon fiber reinforced polymer materials.

The authors would also like to thank Mr. Rahim Reshadi, Mr. Craig Buechel, and Mr. Kiran Lamichhane of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee for organizing and assisting in the experimental setup and monitoring of the specimens.

TECHNICAL REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. Report No. WHRP 05-01		2. Government Accession No		3. Recipient's Catalog No	
4. Title and Subtitle Rehabilitation Techniques for Concrete Bridges				5. Report Date: March 2005	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Authors Habib Tabatabai, Al Ghorbanpoor, and Amy Turnquist-Nass				8. Performing Organization Report No. CEM-050301	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Department of Civil Engineering and Mechanics University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee 3200 N. Cramer Street Milwaukee, WI 53211				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No. 0092-01-06	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Wisconsin Department of Transportation 4802 Sheboygan Avenue Madison, WI 73707-7965				13. Type of Report and Period Covered January 2001-March 2005	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes Research was funded by the Wisconsin DOT and FHWA through the Wisconsin Highway Research Program. Wisconsin DOT contact: Mr. Stanley Woods (608) 266-8348					
16. Abstract This research project addresses rehabilitation techniques for reinforced and prestressed concrete bridges, focusing primarily on corrosion of prestressed concrete beam-ends. An extensive literature database on repair of concrete bridges was developed using Microsoft Access. A limited, first version of an expert system computer program, Concrete Bridge Assessment and Rehabilitation (ConBAR), was developed to assist in diagnosis of concrete bridge deterioration problems and to identify repair, rehabilitation, or preventative maintenance options. The effectiveness of several repair methods in mitigating corrosion damage and providing protection to prestressed concrete beam-ends was evaluated experimentally. These methods included silane sealers, epoxy coatings, patching, polymer (resin) coatings and fiber-reinforced polymer (FRP) wraps.					
17. Key Words Rehabilitation, repair, concrete bridges, corrosion, expert system, patching, FRP, sealers, prestressed concrete			18. Distribution Statement No restriction. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield VA 22161		
19. Security Classif.(of this report) Unclassified		19. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified		20. No.of Pages 315	
				21. Price	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This research project addressed rehabilitation techniques for reinforced and prestressed concrete bridges, focusing primarily on corrosion of prestressed concrete beam-ends. The primary objectives of this research were: (1) to collect and synthesize information on rehabilitation methods for concrete bridges (2) to evaluate the effectiveness of preventative and corrective methods to address deterioration of prestressed concrete beam-ends and (3) to initiate development of an expert system software program to assist in the assessment, diagnosis, and repair of concrete bridges.

A comprehensive review of available literature in the field of rehabilitation of concrete bridges, especially in northern climates, was performed. The results of this review are summarized in this report. In addition, an extensive literature database on repair of concrete bridges was developed using Microsoft[®] Access. Information on a total of 570 papers and reports are included in this searchable database.

An initial version of an expert system computer program, Concrete Bridge Assessment and Rehabilitation (ConBAR), was developed to assist in the diagnosis of concrete bridge deterioration problems and to identify repair, rehabilitation, or preventative maintenance options. This program includes a user-friendly interface that obtains relevant information on the subject bridge through a series of questions, and provides suggestions and recommendations to the user. The depth and variety of questions that ConBAR asks the user before making recommendations far exceed the scope of previous attempts at developing such expert system tools for concrete bridges. This necessitates a very large set of expert rules (based on combinations of possible answers) that must be incorporated into the program. This

program currently includes the complete infrastructure required as well as a limited number of expert rules, which must be expanded and enhanced in future developments of this program.

Based on the results of the literature review, a test plan was developed to address corrosion-induced damage and subsequent repair of beams-ends due to chloride-laden water infiltrating through faulty expansion joints. This problem was selected for experimental evaluation because of its prevalence in northern states such as Wisconsin, and the lack of proven methods to address them. The effectiveness of several preventive solutions/repair methods in mitigating damage and providing corrosion protection was evaluated experimentally. These included localized applications of silane sealers, epoxy coatings, patching, polymer resin coating, and fiber-reinforced polymer (FRP) wraps.

A total of five 36-inch-deep, 8-ft-long prestressed concrete beam specimens were fabricated and tested. The two ends of each beam were either left untreated or were treated using different protective materials and procedures. The beam-ends were subjected to wet/dry cycles of salt-water sprays together with imposition of an impressed electric current to accelerate the corrosion process. After an initial exposure period of 6 months, some of the previously untreated beam-ends were also repaired/protected. The accelerated corrosion process was then continued. The total exposure period for all specimens was 1-½ years. A series of tests were performed during the exposure period. These included half-cell potential measurements, corrosion current measurements, strain measurements, and chloride content measurements. At the conclusion of testing, the end regions of the test specimens were partially dissected to visually examine the state of corrosion of strands.

At the conclusion of the experimental program, an evaluation of various treatments was made. These evaluations were based on the extent of cracking observed, measured chloride penetrations, and observed extent of corrosion during dissection. The best solution is determined to be treating the beam-ends from the first day, i.e. before installation in the field. The treatment area would be limited to all surfaces within a 2-ft-length at the two ends of each beam. This includes the back end surface and the bottom surface. When the strands are cut flush with the back of the beam, the treatment must cover the cut end well to prevent horizontal migration of chlorides through interstitial spaces between wires. In cases where the strands are not cut flush (i.e. embedded in the diaphragm concrete), the exposed strand must be coated well to prevent horizontal chloride migration.

This approach (treatment from the first day) is far more effective, and easier, than subsequent treatments in the field. The carbon fiber-reinforced polymer (FRP) coating, and polymer resin coating (FRP without fiber) were found to be the most effective treatments. Epoxy coating was the next best solution followed by silane treatment. As expected, leaving the beam-end untreated resulted in the worst overall performance.

Considering that the FRP wrap, polymer resin coating, and epoxy coating were generally effective, it is recommended that either polymer (resin) coating or epoxy coating be used in new construction to protect the prestressed concrete beam-ends. The FRP wraps did not significantly improve performance over polymer resin coating, and would only add to the cost and difficulty of treatment. Since protecting the end face of the beam and the cut ends of the strands are crucial, it is recommended that such treatments be performed in advance of installation in the field. The presence of diaphragms, bearings or other obstructions would

likely make the field application of coatings to the beam-ends very difficult; especially after the diaphragm and deck concrete is cast.

For existing prestressed concrete beam-ends, it is recommended that the protective treatments be applied as soon as possible, before chloride levels increase significantly. It is expected that the applications of polymer resin coating or epoxy-coatings to the exposed surfaces of the beam-ends in the field would contribute, albeit not as effectively, to the protection of beam-ends in the long run, if such treatments are implemented before chloride contaminations and corrosion have taken hold. In such cases, all exposed surfaces should be treated with either polymer resin coating or epoxy coating. The extent of pre-existing chloride contamination can be measured in the field (on the bottom flange at about 2 inches from the end of the beam) and compared against chloride contents measured in areas not exposed to chloride contaminations.

In cases where corrosion and damage is advanced and has resulted in cracking and spalling of the beam-ends, the conventional patching alone would likely not be a durable repair method. Although not tested in this experimental effort, a patch repair that is subsequently coated with polymer resin coating or epoxy coating would likely provide a more effective repair.

Although the above results and recommendations were based on tests on beam-ends, it is expected that they would also be applicable to pier elements (such as pier caps and columns) and abutments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
DISCLAIMER	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
LIST OF TABLES	xx
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Problem Statement	1
1.2 Background and Significance of Work	1
1.3 Objectives	2
1.4 Scope of Work and Study Approach	3
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Corrosion Mechanisms	8
2.3 Deicing Salts & Corrosion Damage	10
2.4 Corrosion Repair Methods.....	12
2.4.1 Conventional Non-Electrical Methods	12
2.4.1.1 Patching	12
2.4.1.2 Overlays	19
2.4.1.3 Surface Treatments	22
2.4.1.3a Coatings.....	23
2.4.1.3b Sealers	25
2.4.1.4 Crack Injection	31
2.4.2 Electrical Methods.....	33
2.4.2.1 Cathodic Protection.....	33
2.4.2.2 Chloride Extraction	39
2.5 Fiber Reinforced Polymer (FRP)	43
2.6 Summary of Corrosion Repair Methods.....	48
2.7 Vehicular Impact Damage	49
2.8 Literature Database	57

3.0 EXPERT SYSTEM SOFTWARE	59
3.1 Background	59
3.2 Expert System Tools	59
3.3 Development of Expert System (ConBAR)	61
4.0 EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM	65
4.1 Introduction	66
4.2 Specimens	66
4.3 Specimen Exposure	68
4.4 Accelerated Corrosion Testing	70
4.5 Monitoring	72
4.6 Repair Materials Used in the Experimental Program	76
4.6.1 Carbon Fiber Reinforced Polymer (CFRP)	76
4.6.2 Polymer (Resin) Coating	79
4.6.3 Epoxy Coating	79
4.6.4 Sealer	80
4.6.5 Patching	81
4.7 Test Plan	83
4.8 Surface Preparation & Treatment Applications	86
5.0 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	89
5.1 Data Gathered	89
5.1.1 Concrete Material Data	90
5.1.2 Chloride Content	91
5.1.3 Corrosion Current	100
5.1.4 Effect of Time on Corrosion Rates in Field Structures	108
5.1.5 Best Fit Curve	109
5.1.6 Steel Loss	116
5.1.7 Half-Cell Potential Data	119
5.1.8 Strain Data	129
5.2 Beam Condition Observations	130
5.2.1 Beam 1	130
5.2.2 Beam 2	136
5.2.3 Beam 3	143
5.2.4 Beam 4	149
5.2.5 Beam 5	154
5.3 Crack Maps	158
5.3.1 Beam 1	158
5.3.2 Beam 2	162
5.3.3 Beam 3	166
5.3.4 Beam 4	170
5.3.5 Beam 5	174
5.3.6 Comparison of Crack Map Results	175
5.4 Dissection of Beam Ends	176
5.5 Assessment of Results	190

6.0 PROPOSED FIELD EVALUATIONS.....	193
6.1 Field Evaluation Plan	193
7.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	195
7.1 Summary and Conclusions.....	195
7.2 Recommendations	203
BIBLIOGRAPHY	206
APPENDIX A: ConBAR Examples	211
APPENDIX B: Specimen Shop Drawings	247
APPENDIX C: Spancrete Test Reports	255
APPENDIX D: Chloride Test Data	267
APPENDIX E: Steel Loss Calculations	285
APPENDIX F: Half-Cell Data & Contours	289

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Number</i>	<i>Page</i>
Figure 1. Damaged Beam-Ends	2
Figure 2. Close-up of Beam End	2
Figure 3. Schematic of Electrochemical Corrosion Process [31]	9
Figure 4. Distress Summary [1]	16
Figure 5. Coatings (top) versus Sealers (bottom) [26]	23
Figure 6. Crack Injection (Under Positive Pressure) [26]	32
Figure 7. Chloride Extraction and Replenishment of Alkalis [26]	40
Figure 8. External Post-tensioning Detail [43].....	52
Figure 9. Single Strand Internal Splice [43].....	53
Figure 10. Metal Sleeve Splice [43].....	53
Figure 11. Sample of Expert System Screen	63
Figure 12. Design Details for Pretensioned Concrete Beam Specimens	67
Figure 13. I-Beam Steel Cage	67
Figure 14. Beam Support System: front view (left) and side view (right)	68
Figure 15. Specimen Exposure	69
Figure 16. Initial Experimental Setup....	69
Figure 17. Final Experimental Setup	70
Figure 18. Corrosion Cell [23]....	71
Figure 19. Wiring Diagram and Data Acquisition System	75
Figure 20. Half-Cell Measurement Point Locations.....	75

Figure 21. Displacement Measurement Locations	73
Figure 22. Installation of CFRP System	77
Figure 23. Laboratory Set-up Prior to Accelerated Corrosion	84
Figure 24. Laboratory Set-up After First Phase of Accelerated Corrosion	85
Figure 25. Repair Method & Time Period for Each Beam End	85
Figure 26. Beam Cross-Section with Patch Repair	87
Figure 27. Comparison of Chloride Contents – Phase I	93
Figure 28. Corrosion Current vs. Time – Beam 1.....	101
Figure 29. Corrosion Current vs. Time – Beam 2.....	102
Figure 30. Corrosion Current vs. Time – Beam 3	103
Figure 31. Corrosion Current vs. Time – Beam 4	104
Figure 32. Corrosion Current vs. Time – Beam 5	105
Figure 33. Effect of Time on Corrosion Rate	109
Figure 34. Best-Fit Curve: Corrosion Current vs. Time – Beam 1	111
Figure 35. Best-Fit Curve: Corrosion Current vs. Time – Beam 2	112
Figure 36. Best-Fit Curve: Corrosion Current vs. Time – Beam 3	113
Figure 37. Best-Fit Curve: Corrosion Current vs. Time – Beam 4	114
Figure 38. Best-Fit Curve: Corrosion Current vs. Time – Beam 5	115
Figure 39. Best-Fit Curve: Corrosion Current vs. Time – All Beam Ends	117
Figure 40. Southeast or Northwest Contour Orientation	121
Figure 41. Southwest or Northeast Contour Orientation	121
Figure 42. Initial Half-Cell Readings Beam 1B – Southeast End (left), Northeast End.....	121
Figure 43. Half-Cell Readings Beam 1B (after 6 months) – Southeast End (left), Northeast End (right)	122

Figure 44. Half-Cell Readings Beam 1B (after 10 months) – Southeast End (left), Northeast End (right)	122
Figure 45. Initial Half-Cell Readings Beam 2A – Southwest End (left), Northwest End (right)	123
Figure 46. Initial Half-Cell Readings Beam 2B – Southeast End (left), Northeast End	123
Figure 47. Half-Cell Readings Beam 2A (after 6 months) – Southwest End (left), Northwest End (right)	124
Figure 48. Half-Cell Readings Beam 2B (after 6 months) – Southeast End (left), Northeast End (right)	124
Figure 49. Half-Cell Readings Beam 2A (after 10 months) – Southwest End (left), Northwest End (right)	125
Figure 50. Half-Cell Readings Beam 2B (after 10 months) – Southeast End (left), Northeast End (right)	125
Figure 51. Half-Cell Readings Beam 2A (after 18 months) – Southwest End (left), Northwest End (right)	126
Figure 52. Half-Cell Readings Beam 2B (after 18 months) – Southeast End (left), Northeast End (right)	126
Figure 53. Initial Half-Cell Readings Beam 3A – Southeast End (left), Northeast End (right)	127
Figure 54. Half-Cell Readings Beam 3B– Southeast End (left), NortheastEnd (right)	127
Figure 55. Initial Half-Cell Readings Beam 4A– Southwest End (left), Northwest End	128
Figure 56. Initial Half-Cell Readings Beam 4B– Southeast End (left), Northeast End (right).	128
Figure 57. Half-Cell Readings Beam 4A(after 6 months) – Southwest End (left), Northwest End (right)	129
Figure 58. Half-Cell Readings Beam 4B(after 6 months) – Southeast End (left), Northeast End (right)	129
Figure 59. Measurement Points	130
Figure 60. Beam 1: West (pre-coated) Beam-End (6 months)	131
Figure 61. Beam End 1A: Southwest Face (left), Northwest Face (right) (6 months).....	132

Figure 62. Beam End 1B: East, initially untreated (after 6 months).....	132
Figure 63. Beam End 1B: Northeast Face (left), Southeast Face (right) (6 months)	133
Figure 64. Beam End 1A: West End (pre-epoxy coated)(after 18 months).....	134
Figure 65. Beam End 1A: Southwest Face (after 18 months)	135
Figure 66. Beam End 1B: (untreated, post-coated) (after 18 months)	135
Figure 67. Beam End 2A: West End (untreated)(after 6 months)	136
Figure 68. Beam End 2A: Northwest Face (after 6 months)	137
Figure 69. Beam End 2B: East Face (untreated, patched)(after 6 months)	137
Figure 70. Beam End 2B: Northeast Face (left), Southeast Face (right)(after 6 months) ...	138
Figure 71. Beam Section Removed for Patch Repair	139
Figure 72. Close-up View of Tendon from Dissected Beam End	139
Figure 73. Application of Bonding Agent (left) and Patch Material (right)	140
Figure 74. Beam End 2A: West End (untreated) (after 10 months)	141
Figure 75. Beam End 2A: Southwest Face (left), Northwest Face (right) (after 18 months) .	141
Figure 76. Beam End 2B: Southeast Face (untreated, patched) (left), Northeast Face (right) (after 18 months)	142
Figure 77. Beam End 2B: Closer views (after 18 months)	142
Figure 78. Beam End 3A: West End (pre-sealed)(after 6 months)	143
Figure 79. Beam End 3A: Southwest Face (left), Northwest Face (right) (after 6 months)....	144
Figure 80. Beam End 3B: East Face (untreated, sealed) (after 6 months)	145
Figure 81. Beam End 3B: Northeast Face (left), Southeast Face (right) (after 6 months) ...	145
Figure 82. Beam End 3A: West End (pre-sealed) (after 10 months)	146
Figure 83. Beam End 3A: West End (pre-sealed) (after 18 months)	147

Figure 84. Beam End 3A: West End (pre-sealed) (after 18 months).....	147
Figure 85. Beam End 3B: East End(After 18 months)	148
Figure 86. Beam End 3B: Northeast Face (left), Southeast Face (right)(After 18 months) ...	148
Figure 87. Beam End 4A: West End (untreated, post-polymer) (after 6 months)	150
Figure 88. Beam End 4A: Southwest Face (left), Northwest Face (right) (after 6 months)....	150
Figure 89. Beam End 4B: East Face (untreated-post-FRP) (After 6 months)	151
Figure 90. Beam End 4B: Northeast Face Southeast Face (right) (After 6 months)	151
Figure 91. Beam End 4A: West End (untreated, post-polymer)(After 10 months)	152
Figure 92. Beam End 4A: Southwest Face (left), Northwest Face (right)(After 18 months) ..	153
Figure 93. Beam End 4B: Northeast (untreated, post-FRP) (left), Southeast (right) (After 18 months)	153
Figure 94. Beam End 5A: West End (pre-polymer) (After 6 months)	154
Figure 95. Beam End 5A: Southwest Face (left), Northwest Face (right) (After 6 months)...	155
Figure 96. Beam End 5B: East Face (pre-FRP) (After 6 months)	155
Figure 97. Beam End 5B: Northeast Face (left), Southeast Face (right) (After 6 months)	156
Figure 98. Beam End 5A: West End (pre-polymer) (After 10 months).....	157
Figure 99. Beam End 5A: Southwest Face (left), Northwest Face (right) (After 18 months)..	157
Figure 100. Beam End 5B: Northeast Face (pre-FRP) (left), Southeast Face (right)(After 18 months)	158
Figure 101. Beam End 1A: West End (top), Southwest (left), Northwest (right) (6 months) .	159
Figure 102. Beam End 1B: East End (top), Southeast (left), Northeast (right) (6 months) ..	160
Figure 103. Beam End 1A: West End (top), Southwest (left), Northwest (right)(18 mon.) ..	161
Figure 104. Beam End 1B: East End (top), Southeast (left), Northeast (right) (18 months) ..	162
Figure 105. Beam End 2A: West End (top), Southwest (left), Northwest (right) (6 months) .	163

Figure 106. Beam End 2B: East End (top), Southeast (left), Northeast (right) (6 months)	.164
Figure 107. Beam End 2A: West End (top), Southwest (left), Northwest (right) (18 mon)	.165
Figure 108. Beam End 2B: East End (top), Southeast (left), Northeast (right) (18 months)	.166
Figure 109. Beam End 3A: West End (top), Southwest (left), Northwest (right) (6 months)	.167
Figure 110. Beam End 3B: East End (top), Southeast (left), Northeast (right) (6 months)	.168
Figure 111. Beam End 3A: West End (top), Southwest (left), Northwest (right) (18 mon)	.169
Figure 112. Beam End 3B: East End (top), Southeast (left), Northeast (right) (18 months)	.170
Figure 113. Beam End 4A: West End (top), Southwest (left), Northwest (right) (6 months)	.171
Figure 114. Beam End 4B: East End (top), Southeast (left), Northeast (right) (6 months)	.172
Figure 115. Beam End 4A: West End (top), Southwest (left), Northwest (right) (18 mon)	.173
Figure 116. Beam End 4B: East End (top), Southeast (left), Northeast (right) (18 months)	.174
Figure 117. Beam End 1A – Treated With Epoxy Coating From Day 1.....	178
Figure 118. Beam End 1B – Treated With Epoxy Coating After 6 Months of Exposure.....	179
Figure 119. Beam End 2A – Not Treated At All.....	180
Figure 120. Beam End 2B – Patch Repair After 6 Months of Exposure.....	181
Figure 121. Beam End 3A – Treated With Silane Sealer From Day 1.....	182
Figure 122. Beam End 3B – Treated With Silane Sealer After 6 Months of Exposure.....	183
Figure 123. Beam End 4A – Treated With Polymer Resin Coating After 6 Months of Exposure.....	184
Figure 124. Beam End 4B – Treated With FRP Wrap After 6 Months of Exposure.....	185
Figure 125. Beam End 5A – Treated With Polymer Resin Coating From Day 1.....	186
Figure 126. Beam End 5B – Treated With FRP Wrap From Day 1.....	187
Figure 127. Comparison of Strands with Respect to Corrosion.....	188
Figure 128. Comparison of Strands with Respect to Corrosion.....	188

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Number</i>	<i>Page</i>
Table 1. Cost (adjusted to 1998) and Life Expectancy for Patching Options [16a, 31a]	13
Table 2. Cost (adjusted to 1998) and Life Expectancy for Overlay Options [16a, 31a]	20
Table 3. Concrete Surface Treatment Selection Guide [8]	28
Table 4. Ranking of Surface Treatments [17a, 28a].....	28
Table 5. Summary of Costs and Life Expectancy for Cathodic Protection Systems [54]	35
Table 6. Severe Vehicle Impact Damage Repair Method to Consider [43]	54
Table 7. Carbon Fiber Sheet Properties	77
Table 8. Primer, Putty, And Resin Properties	78
Table 9. REPLARK 30 Composite Properties	79
Table 10. Coating Performance Data	80
Table 11. Sealer Performance Data.....	81
Table 12. Vericoat Supreme Mechanical Properties	82
Table 13. CORR-BOND Technical Information	83
Table 14. Laboratory Test Plan	84
Table 15. Surface Treatment Application Information	86
Table 16. Concrete Cylinder Average Compressive Strength at Release	90
Table 17. Concrete Cylinder Peak Compressive Strength	90
Table 18. Initial Chloride Content of Prestressed Concrete Beam	91
Table 19. Chloride Content of Prestressed Concrete Beam After First Exposure Cycle	93

Table 20. Final Acid-Soluble Chloride Content of Prestressed Concrete Beam End 1A (Epoxy-Coated from Day 1).....	95
Table 21. Final Acid-Soluble Chloride Content of Prestressed Concrete Beam End 1B (Epoxy-Coated after 6 Months of Exposure).....	95
Table 22. Final Acid-Soluble Chloride Content of Prestressed Concrete Beam End 2A (No Treatment).....	95
Table 23. Final Acid-Soluble Chloride Content of Prestressed Concrete Beam End 2B (Patch Repair after 6 Months of Exposure).....	96
Table 24. Final Acid-Soluble Chloride Content of Prestressed Concrete Beam End 3A (Silane Sealer from Day 1).....	96
Table 25. Final Acid-Soluble Chloride Content of Prestressed Concrete Beam End 3B (Silane Sealer after 6 Months of Exposure).....	96
Table 26. Final Acid-Soluble Chloride Content of Prestressed Concrete Beam End 4A (Polymer Resin Coating After 6 Months of Exposure).....	97
Table 27. Final Acid-Soluble Chloride Content of Prestressed Concrete Beam End 4B (FRP Wrap after 6 Months of Exposure).....	97
Table 28. Final Acid-Soluble Chloride Content of Prestressed Concrete Beam End 5A (Polymer Resin Coating Since Day 1).....	98
Table 29. Final Acid-Soluble Chloride Content of Prestressed Concrete Beam End 4B (FRP Wrap Since Day 1).....	98
Table 30. Comparative Chloride Content Ratings for All Beam-Ends Based on 24-hr Data at 0.75 and 1.5 in. Depths.....	99
Table 31. Steel Loss	118
Table 32. Numerical Rating of the Extent of Cracking Observed After 18 Months of Exposure.....	175
Table 33. Numerical Rating of the Extent of Corrosion Observed on Strands After 18 Months of Exposure.....	177
Table 34. Comparison of Various Beam-End Numerical Ratings and Overall Ratings.....	191

